



# City of Tempe

MINUTES FOR THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(CAC) MEETING

5:20-8:30pm June 25, 2001  
Tempe Library, Conf. Board rm.

## ATTENDANCE:

Rich Nolan	John Kane
Kirby Spittler	Darin Sender
Mike Patten	Michael DiDomenico
Todd Marshall	Cheri Edington
Ruben Valenzuela	Helen Stern
Kathryn Heffernan	John DiTullio
Roger Millar, OTAK	Scot Siegel, OTAK
Fred Brittingham	Grace Kelly
Bonnie Richardson	Ryan Levesque
Mary Ann Miller	

- **INTRODUCTION BY FRED BRITTINGHAM**
- **OVERVIEW OF NEIGHBORHOOD PHOTO SURVEY, OTAK**
- The Design Review Board differences with staff are a good thing. It is the understanding that practitioners are more in touch with the Design Review Board rather than staff. The DRB is a citizen buffer between staff and designers.
- Multi-Family guidelines. It is up to the designer to take what is required in the quality rating study and utilize those elements for their project. The problem is that the current guidelines don't follow character concerns for particular neighborhoods.
- Are the neighborhood plans for areas listed in the toolbox? Yes they are in there, along with Neighborhood plans are specific area plans, overlays, and zoning districts, which would consider development impact and character in a particular area.
- We currently have two Strategic Plans, one in Northwest Tempe and the other in North Tempe. Along with that we also have APAC for Apache Boulevard. More specifically Sunset/Riverside has a plan, which considered a part of the Northwest Tempe area.
- In regards to Board of Adjustment requests for variances, usually the board has no choice to look at the design aspect of a project. BOA and DRB have different issues when it comes to approval of the project. When DRB makes an approval of a project and BOA hasn't approved the project, it's difficult to deny any variances when the design of the project is already approved. The concern goes both ways.
- Planning and Zoning and the Design Review Board have similar situations. Scottsdale is a great example for processing applications. Infill projects with (P&Z and DRB) and (DRB and BOA) processing have combining issues, which should be combined to accommodate concerns as a whole. The regular process for suburban development is fine the way it is.
- Maybe there should be two types of development processes. PAD's and MG types of development take longer to go through than the current process of other projects.

- Limit the processing for example, small modifications to standards on setbacks. Allow small variances that are only say, 10% off from the required setbacks, with an administrative sign off.
- Explain some concepts for Use Permit procedures. Tempe is unique in that our process allows us to talk to City Council about the project, but not about the variances related to the project. Can you have both BOA and City Council act as variance approval processes. There is question to the legality of it.
- I would like the Hearing Officer to have more authority, to either approve or disapprove applications. An appeal of the Hearing Officer's decision would go to the Board of Adjustment if there were additional concerns.
- Having a more thorough pre-application process, with developers meeting with neighborhoods is a great idea. Have the developers discuss plans at a more preliminary level, find out what concerns the community has before plans are hard-lined. Recognized boards and associations in the area of a project should be notified, as well as property owners within the vicinity. All the various groups could meet at a neutral location.
- Neighborhood notification could be part of the pre-application process. Be careful about how early the developers are required to go to the neighbors in the process.
- One concern is when a project is presented for example to NWT PAAB, recommendations on the project are forwarded to the appropriate staff, boards and commissions. During the application process the project changes from what was originally presented to the PAAB. The perception is given that the board or neighbors were misled.
- People that speak as representatives for the neighborhood have one opinion and the directly effected residents have another.
- SAP (Specific Area Plan) will document the desires of the neighborhood.
- The developer has got to be more aggressive in getting the notice out there about the project. Do not solely rely on County Assessors information to inform property owners. Be more conscience about letting residents know what's going on.
- The goals and objectives need to be stressed to educate all boards, commissions, and council about the concept of what we are trying to achieve. Educate new members who enter in on the vision.
- The new zoning ordinance will make sure that it represents what the general plan's vision is.
- Incentives to have development "done right", was not mentioned in the toolbox. As we build denser, the project should already have achieved its benefit for the developer. Incentives are based on what the community wants. For example, fee waivers for affordable housing. What incentives appeal from both sides of the fence?
- People's life style sometimes don't accommodate mixed-use development in some areas of Tempe.
- You do an analysis of how far you could walk in a quarter mile. This will tell you if you have a pedestrian oriented area or the area is not compatible for that type of development.
- Commercial Districts: Intensifying our normal shopping centers at major arterial intersections are usually harder to increase the density. Though, there are old shopping centers like Danielle Plaza (SWC of Mill/Southern), which would be a good area to just start over and redevelop.
- Climate appropriate trees and scale should be considered in the landscape section. A performance based system for landscaping should determine the necessary separation requirements and other size requirements.

- Screen walls: what is the intent of the wall? If you can identify the parking lot as more than just asphalt paving, the screen wall is not necessary. One viewpoint of the screen walls intent is to not confuse drivers on the road from headlights.
- The right-of-way is a publicly owned space that has a great potential for utilization.
- Landscape percentage reduction in the Downtown was mentioned in the toolbox. Instead of doing away with required landscape, maybe it should be the required percentage of landscape minus the building coverage on site.
- Parking: Consider tandem parking for multi-family districts. On-street parking is also an opportunity. The option of reverse angle parking, where the driver would back into the space and when leaving would be able to see if there were any on coming bicyclists. A safer alternative option.
- Minimum and maximum parking requirements. Allow different thresholds of parking requirements going beyond the max., such as providing pavement alternatives, increasing the landscape requirement for the site, etc.
- Excess parking for future development. Have an alternative other than providing the additional parking.
- Bicycle parking, Maricopa County trip reduction program, could be an option to use in the rewrite.
- The sign ordinance section should be explored, especially related to square foot size requirements. Its obvious that signage has not been a part of the project. The sign section needs some serious discussion.
- One problem is that when an applicant comes in and a sign package is presented to the board, it doesn't relate to the project. The initial design of the project is presented without any consideration to where and what the size of signage would be necessary. The sign package is brought in late in the stages of development, making it difficult for flexibility.
- Refuse, Fire, and A.D.A. requirements, which effect the design of a project should be looked at in the regulatory review.
- Accessibility for parking structures should allow high profile vehicles inside. Pedestrian friendly should mean ADA accessible.
- Staff and Otak, advised the CAC of a possible meeting on July 26<sup>th</sup>, since Otak will be in town. This meeting would cover information about the future role of the CAC. Staff will wait to receive responses from members, whether or not we will have the meeting.
- Adjourned at 8:50pm.